7th August 1929]

Assessment on the wet lands of certain villages of Rayadrug taluk.

*75 Q.—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are levying any special rate on the wet lands of Vyaparalla, Kasipuram and Kenchanapalli of Rayadrug taluk, Bellary district, for doing necessary work to the spring channels in the Hagari river and are assuring a better supply to the tanks concerned ;

(b) if so, the date of introduction of the rate, the conditions of its levy and the tank or tanks, and the year or years respectively in which those conditions were fulfilled ; and

(c) whether the fee was remitted with reference to the tank or the year in which the conditions were not fulfilled, and, if not, why not ?

A.—(a) to (c) A report has been called for.

Public Service

Exemption to unpassed clerks in the High Court.

*76 Q.—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether, with reference to G.O. Mis. No. 47, Public, dated 18th January 1927, the High Court compiled and sent to the Government a list of unpassed permanent clerks and examiners whom they considered fit for exemption ; and

(b) if so, when the said list was received by the Government and what orders were passed by them thereon ?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) On the 27th June 1928 : the matter is under consideration.

Inadmissibility of second appeals by public servants against departmental punishment.

*77 Q.—Mr. S. Satyamurti : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons why the Government declared about July 1928 that second appeals by public servants against departmental punishment were inadmissible ;

(b) whether the Government have ascertained as to whether such a rule obtains in other provinces ;

(c) whether Government have considered the hardship which these rules are likely to entail, especially in the case of officers in the Police service ; and

(d) whether the Government propose to rescind this order ; and if not, why not ?

A.—(a) The classification rules provide for only one appeal as of right and the Government in 1927 saw no particular necessity for statutory provision of a second, having regard to the fact that access by memorial remained unaffected.

(b) No.

(c) & (d) The Government do not consider that any hardship is being caused to subordinate officers, including Police subordinates, by the existing rules. They do not therefore propose to modify them.